

09/324,149

**REMARKS**

This request for reconsideration is being submitted on January 20, 2004 . A response to paper No. 14, mailed 10/21/2003 is due on or before January 21, 2004. Accordingly, this response is timely filed. Applicants respectfully request the response submitted herewith be made of record in the present application.

***POWER OF ATTORNEY***

Filed herewith is an associate power of attorney for the present application to Charles R. Nold.

***Claim Status***

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS*****35 U.S.C. §102***

Claims 1-6, 12-15 and 17-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Jaskie (U.S. Patent No. 5,442,254). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The fluorescent screen of Jaskie is fundamentally different in construction than that claimed in the present invention. The present claim 1 requires a "plurality of pixels of different colors". Jaskie does not teach this; at best Jaskie discloses a plurality of nanocrystals of different colors, but this is different. Figures 1a-1g in the present application more clearly explain this difference. Referring to Figure 1a there is shown an array 12 of red nanocrystals (14) to form a single pixel (16). Thus, in the present application, a plurality nanocrystals combine to form a single pixel, each potentially of a

09/324,149

different color. Jaskie does not teach this structure. Referring to Fig 2 of Jaskie, there is disclosed an array of nanocrystals, *but they are not arranged into a pixel array* as required by Applicant's claims. An examination of the method that is used in Jaskie to excite the nanocrystals will also demonstrate the structural distinction between Applicant's claims and that of Jaskie. Jaskie uses his array of nanocrystals in one or two environments, either a fluorescent tube (light bulb) or a CRT (TV screen). The fluorescent tube only has one wavelength of excitation, that that is produced by the bulb, and thus only one color nanocrystal would be used, coated evenly in an array. But in the CRT, multiple colors are desirable. Jaskie gets his multiple colors not by orchestrating his nanocrystals into a pixel array as disclosed by Applicant, but merely by putting them all together in an array and then using an external address system (60 in Fig 5) to shine a light of a selected wavelength which will then cause the nanocrystal to emit. The pixel array of Jaskie is in the address system, not in the nanocrystal array as required by Applicant's claims.

This distinction is not taught or fairly disclosed in either Jaskie or the other prior art of record. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been overcome, and withdrawal is requested.

*35 U.S.C. §103(a)*

Claims 7-11 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Jaskie (U.S. Patent No. 5,442,254) in view of Yagyu (U.S. Patent No. 5,856,814). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. It is Applicant's position the Jaskie fails as a primary reference for the reasons presented above. Accordingly, the use

09/324,149

of Jaskie in the 103 rejection must also fail. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been overcome, and withdrawal is requested.

*Conclusion*

Having overcome all rejections, Applicants respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this application. If a telephone conversation will expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is kindly invited to call Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

All fees believed due have been submitted. If Applicant is wrong in this assumption, the PTO is authorized to charge any deficiency to Applicant's account number 120690. The PTO is not authorized to charge the issue fee to this account.

Respectfully Submitted,



1/20/2004

Charles R. Nold  
Reg. No. 46,470

Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley  
National Laboratory  
One Cyclotron Road  
MS 90B0104  
Berkeley, CA 94720  
Telephone No. 510 486-6503